



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

We hope that our readers will be able to judge from our extracts of the interest and the rarity of such a book as this "Romance of the Harem." Those who take it up will find it a most impressive volume, one that is by no means merely entertaining. It lifts the veil from what was unknown ground; all who care for more than the commonplaces of many travellers' gossip will be glad to read it.

---

4. — *Literature and Dogma. An Essay towards a better Apprehension of the Bible.* By MATTHEW ARNOLD, D. C. L., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford and Fellow of Oriel College. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1873.

THE writings of other than theologians about the Bible have seldom been anything else than either loud-mouthed abuse, which has generally borne its condemnation on its face, or, in later times, the contemptuous utterance of scientific men, who may have been civiler in form, though at heart they have been equally hostile to the book, so that now there is but little chance of unprejudiced hearing for a man who brings a new test to its examination. Theologians and students of science, of course, with numerous exceptions among both classes, are not eminent among men for their desire thoroughly to understand the position of those who criticise them, or patiently to seek a ground of truth on which dissentient opinions may possibly meet. In this respect the Church is at least consistent; it has withstood a great deal in its time, and so need not be too much perturbed at new attacks; and the dogmatism of science, offensive though it be, is a very natural accompaniment of sudden and marvellous success. But if there is nothing miraculous in the faults of human nature, they are all the more to be regretted on that account, and very much more if the result in the case of the book before us should be that contempt is hurled upon so serious and painstaking an attempt to give expression to the sort of thought which lies between theological and scientific dogmatism as is found in Mr. Arnold's essay. It is to be remembered that it nowhere pretends to be an authoritative assertion of absolute truth; it is only an attempt to give utterance to a deep religious feeling, which finds itself repelled by what to many seem too hard formulæ for the hungry heart to receive. Of course the book is strongly flavored with the writer's personality; probably no other man will agree with it thoroughly, nor is it desirable that any one should; but it will be found to express in words a great deal which many had been unconsciously working out in their minds. And a book which does this in a temperate spirit is sure to make a

mark and to leave a name in the history of its time. A violent spirit is apt to do a great deal of mischief which has to be undone later; it is when men are calm that they are strongest in argument, and although there are signs of human emotion in this book, such as the perpetual twitting of the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester, which to us in this country will doubtless seem uncalled for, it is to be remembered how much more weight those men have in England than is possible for the occupants of similar positions here. Their influence is vast, and hence they become prominent objects of attack. Another charge which has been frequently brought against Mr. Arnold is, that of irreverence in his comparison of the Trinity to three Lords Shaftesbury, and in this we would by no means try to defend him. Notwithstanding the frequent use of this device in controversy, it may be said that it is not by pointing out unessential errors that a book is refuted or that an accurate impression is given of its contents; let us then rather give a brief analysis of this essay which shall convey to the reader the principal positions held by Mr. Arnold.

In the first place, as those who are familiar with his previous writings might have imagined, he utters his usual plea for culture as an important aid in the advancement of the world. Many who do not care to burn school-houses and libraries are continually offended by the lavish use made of this word, or, rather, its abuse. Especially is this true, when, as is often the case, it is an apology for every form of scrappiness in education and accomplishment, when it is taken for granted that any one who has acquired a smattering of many things must thereby be a wiser man than he who has pondered a great deal over a few questions; which is as sensible an opinion to hold as would be one that to wander through the picture-galleries of Europe could make all tourists great artists. Culture can never be more than one of many aids in the growth of the human mind; it is to be desired for the use that may be made of it, but it does not do away with the natural differences between the ability of different minds. As Mr. Arnold uses it in his Preface, it hardly means more than literary method, which he applies to the consideration of the Bible. This may seem a simpler step than a first one in any new direction is apt to be; but that this is done, and done with such fairness, is what makes his book what it is.

He begins with noting the difference between literary and scientific terms as they are employed in the Bible, illustrating his position by the different ways in which the term *God* is understood. "People use it," he says, "as if it stood for a perfectly definite and ascertained idea, from which we might, without more ado, extract propositions and draw inferences, just as we should from any other definite and ascertained

idea. . . . But, in truth, the word 'God' is used in most cases — not by the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester, but by mankind in general — as by no means a term of science or exact knowledge, but a term of poetry and eloquence, a term *thrown out*, so to speak, at a not fully grasped object of the speaker's consciousness, — a literary term, in short; and mankind mean different things by it as their consciousness differs." A few pages further on, he says: "The object of religion is *conduct*; and conduct is really, however men may overlay it with philosophical disquisitions, the simplest thing in the world. That is to say, it is the simplest thing in the world as far as understanding is concerned; as regards doing, it is the hardest thing in the world." Further on he says: "It extends to rightness in the whole range of what we call conduct; in three fourths, therefore, at the very lowest computation, of human life. The only doubt is, whether we ought not to make the range of conduct wider still, and to say it is four fifths of human life or five sixths." Among the Jews was found the feeling of the importance of conduct; they had a stronger admiration of righteousness, or, rather, their admiration was less complicated by admiration of other things than was the case with other peoples. Their idea of God, Mr. Arnold says, was as The Eternal, *the not ourselves which makes for righteousness*, and here the question will arise whether he is justified in denying that they held a belief in a personal Deity; but this is a question which cannot be decided by the literary method alone; scholars will also have something to say about it. Later there arose among the Jews a less exalted notion of what their God was going to bring to them; instead of calmly accepting the fact that "righteousness tendeth to life," they looked for some more tangible result as a reward for their right doing; at first it was nothing but a vague, indefinite longing, hardly different from hope, but in time it changed into a belief in material progress.

Then came Christianity with its new message to man, that of the necessity of *personal religion*. Christ "put things in such a way that his hearer was led to take each rule or fact of conduct by its inward side, its effect on the heart and character; then the reason of the thing, the meaning of what had been mere matter of blind rule, flashed upon him. . . . To find his own soul, his true and permanent self, became set up in man's view as his chief concern, as the secret of happiness; and so it really is." Again: "Christ made his followers first look within and examine themselves; he made them feel that they had a best and real self as opposed to their ordinary and apparent one, and that their happiness depended on saving themselves from being overborne. And then, by recommending, and still more by himself exemplifying in his

own practice, by the exhibition in himself, with the most prepossessing pureness, clearness, and beauty, of the two qualities by which our ordinary self is indeed most essentially counteracted, *self-renouncement* and *mildness*, he made his followers feel that in these qualities lay the secret of their best self; that to attain them was in the highest degree requisite and natural, and that a man's happiness depended upon it." In this way "was the great doctrine of the Old Testament, *To righteousness belongs happiness!* made a true and potent word again." In time, however, arose the belief that "the mild, inward, self-renouncing, and sacrificed Servant of the Eternal, the new and better Messiah, was yet, before the present generation passed, to come on the clouds of heaven in power and glory." Since the Advent failed to come then, it was supposed that it would arrive at a later time; "the future and the miraculous engaged the chief attention of Christians; and in accordance with this strain of thought, they more and more rested the proof of Christianity, not on its internal evidence, but on prediction and miracle." Then follow two interesting chapters, one on the proof from prophecy, the other on proof from miracles. From this last chapter we will quote a few lines:—

"That miracles, when fully believed, are felt by men in general to be a source of authority, it is absurd to deny. One may say, indeed: Suppose I could change the pen with which I write this into a pen-wiper, I should not thus make what I write any the truer or more convincing. That may be so in reality, but the mass of mankind feel differently. In the judgment of the mass of mankind, could I visibly and undeniably change the pen with which I write this into a pen-wiper, not only would this which I write acquire a claim to be held perfectly true and convincing, but I should even be entitled to affirm, and to be believed in affirming, propositions the most palpably at war with common fact and experience. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the proneness of the human mind to take miracles as evidence, and to seek for miracles as evidence; or the extent to which religion, and religion of a true and admirable kind, has been, and is still, held in connection with a reliance upon miracles. To pick Scripture miracles one by one to pieces is an odious and repulsive task; it is also an unprofitable one," and Mr. Arnold does not undertake to do it. He contents himself with showing the possibility of error under which those who have given us an account of them labored, and how uncertain is the test which the mind of the believer applies to their examination. To him they are matters of less importance than the other parts of the New Testament. It is interesting to compare his method with that of Strauss and the Tübingen school, in this matter of miracles; Strauss

dissects every account with the utmost care and exactness, as if he were anxious to build an intrenched camp of disbelief, which should forever serve for the protection and comfort of those who did not belong to the camp of orthodox belief, while, in comparison, Mr. Arnold leaves it an open question which is to be settled by the gradual change of opinion in men's minds.

The two chapters which follow, which are entitled, respectively, "The New Testament Record," and "The Testimony of Jesus to himself," are, perhaps, the most interesting in the book. Here the literary method, especially in the hands of so able a man as Mr. Arnold, is particularly useful. There is no call for profound historical or philological study to aid in the treatment of the questions which come up; we have the account of one man, who, it might almost be said, is nearly a contemporary of ours, in comparison with the ancient Israelites; we have often his very words, and, although they will carry a different meaning to every heart, varying with the nature and experience of the individual, they nevertheless were spoken directly to men; they were not designed as subjects for abstruse discussion or dogmatic reasoning.

It is impossible to give an analysis which shall be in any way complete, of what is itself a brief analysis of the New Testament. A few lines of extract must suffice to show the tact with which this work is done. For instance:—

"But search and sift the idea of righteousness Jesus did. And though the work of Jesus, like the name of God, calls up in the believer a multitude of emotions and associations far more than any brief definition can cover, yet, remembering Jeremy Taylor's advice to avoid exhortations *to get Christ, to be in Christ*, and to seek some more distinct and practical way of speaking of him, we shall not do ill, perhaps, if we summarize to our own minds his work by saying, that he restored the intuition of God through transforming the idea of righteousness; and that, to do this, he brought a *method*, and he brought a *secret*. And of those two great words which fill such a place in his gospel, *repentance* and *peace*,—as we see that his Apostles, when they preached his gospel, preached '*Repentance* unto life' and '*Peace* through Jesus Christ,'—of these two great words, one, *repentance*, attaches itself, we shall find, to his *method*, and the other, *peace*, to his *secret*." Again: "And now, too, we can see why it is a mistake, and may lead to much error, to exhibit any series of maxims, like those of the Sermon on the Mount, as the ultimate sum and formula into which Christianity may be run up. Maxims of this kind are but *applications* of the method and secret of Jesus; and the method and secret are capable of yet an infinite number more of such applications.

Christianity is a *source*; no one supply of water and refreshment that comes from it can be called the sum of Christianity." "A method of *inwardness*, a secret of *self-renouncement*; but can any statement of what Jesus brought be complete, which does not take in his *mildness*? To the representative texts already given there is certainly to be added this other: '*Learn of me that I am mild and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls!*' Shall we attach mildness to the *method*, because, without it, a clear and limpid view inwards is impossible? Or shall we attach it to the *secret*?—the dying to faults of temper is a part, certainly, of dying to one's ordinary self, one's *life in this world*. *Mildness*, however, is rather an element in which, in Jesus, both method and secret worked; the medium through which both the method and secret were exhibited. We may think of it as perfectly illustrated and exemplified in his answer to the foolish question, *Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?*—when, taking a little child and setting him in the midst, he said, 'Whosoever receives the kingdom of God as a little child, the same is the greatest in it.' Here are both inward appraisal and self-renouncement; but what is the most admirable is the 'sweet reasonableness,' the exquisite, mild, winning felicity with which the renouncement and the inward appraisal are applied and conveyed."

The two following chapters, "The Early Witnesses," and "Aberglaube reinvading," discuss the later books of the New Testament, and the appearance and spread of certain of the dogmas of the Church. He gives us instances of the way in which literal criticism has perverted the true meaning of texts, and draws, as it seems to us, discreetly an outline of the main differences between Catholicism and Protestantism: "And many of the reproaches cast by one on the other are idle. If Catholicism is reproached with being indifferent to much that is called *civilization*, it must be answered, So was Jesus. If Protestantism, with its private judgment, is accused of opening a wide field for individual fancies and mistakes, it must be answered, So did Jesus when he introduced his method. Private judgment, 'the fundamental and insensate doctrine of Protestantism,' as Joseph de Maistre calls it, is in truth but the necessary 'method,' the eternally incumbent *duty*, imposed by Jesus himself, when he said, 'Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.' 'Judge *righteous* judgment is the duty imposed; and the duty is not, whatever many Protestants may seem to think, fulfilled if the judgment be *wrong*. But the duty of inwardly judging is the very entrance into the way and walk of Jesus."

From the chapter entitled "Our 'Masses' and the Bible," we have

room for but a single brief extract: "Thus we have the authority of both Old and New Testament placed on just the same solid basis as the authority of the injunction to take food and rest, namely, that experience proves we cannot do without them. And we have neglect of the Bible punished just as putting one's hand into the fire is punished, namely, by finding we are the worse for it. Only, to *attend* to this experience about the Bible needs more steadiness than to attend to the momentary impressions of hunger, fatigue, and pain; therefore it is called *faith*, and accounted a virtue. But the appeal is to experience in this case just as much as in the other; only to experience of a far deeper and greater kind."

In his chapter, "The true Greatness of Christianity," we find the following: "But there is this difference between the religion of the Old Testament and Christianity. Of the religion of the Old Testament we can pretty well see to the end; we can trace fully enough the experimental proof of it in history. But of Christianity the future is as yet almost unknown. For that the world cannot get on without righteousness we have the clear experience, and a grand and admirable experience it is. But what the world will become by the thorough use of that which is really righteousness, the method and the secret and the secret reasonableness of Jesus, we have as yet hardly any experience at all." Again: "Walking on the water, multiplying loaves, raising corpses, a heavenly judge appearing with trumpets in the clouds while we are yet alive, — what is this compared to the real experience offered as witness to us by Christianity?"

It is with an earnest recurrence to these qualities of Christianity, to the appeal to the conscience and the self-renouncement it inculcates, that he closes this remarkable essay. Even those who are not convinced with the soundness of his theological views, will be unable to deny the reality of his religious feeling, as men know it in their moments of joy and grief when their hearts either forget dogmas entirely or use them but as a sort of language to express their emotions to the Unknown. The rejection of dogma, as Mr. Arnold shows, is apt to carry with it the rejection of the all-important truths which lie behind them and which they once expressed, but he seeks everywhere to show that these truths are essential to the well-being of man. That at times he may have missed the mark in this most difficult task, the ascertaining the meaning of men who undertook to express immortal things with all the limitations of language, it would be impossible to affirm. But we can assure every reader that he will find here a serious intention, and a sympathetic treatment which, if it does not convince, will, at any rate, be found extremely suggestive. It certainly



tends to help Christianity, however hostile it may be found to separate sects. Our extracts, copious as they have been, will not be found to have done the book full justice; we hope, however, that they may inspire some readers with a desire to study his interesting and valuable essay.

---

5.—*St. Peter, an Oratorio*.—By JOHN K. PAINE. Boston. 1873.

As text for his oratorio Mr. Paine has chosen the history of St. Peter as narrated in the Gospels, and has condensed it into the form of a consecutive story which shall present the most important incidents in the life of this disciple in the vivid and contrasting situations allowed by dramatic license. Strictest adherence to original Biblical texts, with freedom in their arrangement, has been observed throughout the work. The concentration and free combination of the events form a notable feature in the denial, where the condensed narrative renders the situation at once dramatic and varied, and intensifies the thus rapidly succeeding moments of the drama of Peter's life.

The oratorio begins in F minor, with slow  $\frac{4}{4}$  movement. Though most of the work has been written on the principle that polyphonic style of composition is the truest musical exponent of Biblical expression, we are confronted at the very outset with a short but subtle account of modern innovation. Instead of the time-honored prelude or pastorage with its second theme a *fuga*, inseparable from the rigid "credo" of our musical forefathers, we find a prologue whose opening lines remind us by their freedom of treatment of our departure from strict ancestral tenets, and tell us of modern reform and philosophical conception. The introduction is such in the strictest sense, and, like those of Gluck, is but preparatory to and finds its climax in the opening chorus, whose powerful unison notes in C major, followed by the ascending of the tenor to the third and of the bass to the octave, proclaim like a blast of trumpets, "The time is fulfilled." The four parts then say in turn, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," passing with full declamatory accent from C minor into G major. It would not be difficult to imagine this portion of the "Divine Call" as belonging directly to the orchestral introduction. It seems like a preparatory outcry to draw attention to the command to "repent and believe," which follows. At this juncture the voices glide into the old form of church music and pursue an impressive theme through strange modulations, back into the key of C major, where in almost breathless tones it repeats the earnest injunction to believe the glad tidings of God. The recitative which follows, narrating the meeting of Jesus with Simon and Andrew as they were fishing, is an unusually fine sample of *arioso* declamation, and,